

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/841,357	04/24/2001	Robert A. Wiedeman	900.0003USU	6251
41339	7590 09/30/2004		EXAMINER	
KARAMBELAS & ASSOCIATES 655 DEEP VALLEY DRIVE, SUITE 303 ROLLING HILLS ESTATES, CA 90274			NGUYEN, BRIAN D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
KOLLING III	indeo do initido, cir 5027 i		2661	
			DATE MAILED: 09/30/200	4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			Au		
		Application No.	Applicant(s)		
		09/841,357	WIEDEMAN ET AL.		
Office Action Summary		Examiner	Art Unit		
		Brian D Nguyen	2661		
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication a r Reply	appears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence address		
THE - External after - If the - If NO - Failu Any I	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION risions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reperiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perion to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state reply received by the Office later than three months after the material patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	N. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reserve within the statutory minimum of thirty od will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON tute, cause the application to become AB	eply be timely filed y (30) days will be considered timely. THS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status					
1)🛛	Responsive to communication(s) filed on the	e application filed 4/24/01.			
2a) <u></u> □	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ T	his action is non-final.			
3)□	☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is				
	closed in accordance with the practice unde	r <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D	11, 453 O.G. 213.		
Dispositi	on of Claims				
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) <u>1-22</u> is/are pending in the application of the above claim(s) is/are withd Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>1-22</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to.	rawn from consideration.			
8)	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	d/or election requirement.			
Applicati	on Papers				
	The specification is objected to by the Exami				
10)⊠	The drawing(s) filed on <u>14 August 2001</u> is/ar				
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	- · · ·			
11)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corr The oath or declaration is objected to by the	· •			
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119	,			
a)[Acknowledgment is made of a claim for forei All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority docume application from the International Bure see the attached detailed Office action for a life	ents have been received. ents have been received in Apriority documents have been eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	oplication No received in this National Stage		
Attachment		" 	(070.440)		
	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		ummary (PTO-413))/Mail Date		
3) 🔲 Inform	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0 No(s)/Mail Date	_	formal Patent Application (PTO-152)		

Application/Control Number: 09/841,357

Art Unit: 2661

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 4 is objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 4, line 2, "DSN server" seems to refer back to "(DSN) server" in line 5 of claim 1. If this is true, it is suggested to change "DSN server" to ---the DSN server---.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee et al (6,161,008).

Regarding claims 1-5, Lee discloses a mobile satellite telecommunications system, comprising: at least one user terminal (140, 142); at least one satellite in earth orbit (138); and at least one gateway (118) bidirectionally coupled to a data communication network (102); and a Domain Name Service (DNS) server (108, 150) for responding to a DNS query that is received from the user terminal; wherein the at least one satellite is in a non-geosynchronous orbit and further comprising at least one satellite in a higher orbit (see figures 1-2; col. 4, lines 3-6; col. 5, lines 7-12). Lee does not specifically disclose the at least one satellite comprises a DSN server and the at least one satellite in a higher orbit comprises a second DSN server. However, to include a DSN server in the satellites is a matter of design choice because a DSN server is a separate

Application/Control Number: 09/841,357

Art Unit: 2661

element that perform the same function no matter where the DSN server is located.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to attached the DSN server to the satellites in order to provides

an association between an IP address and a device domain name for users in a satellite

network.

Regarding claims 6-11, claims 6-11 are apparatus claims that have substantially the same limitations as the apparatus claims 1-6. Therefore, they are subject to the same rejection.

Regarding claims 12-12, claims 12-22 are method claims that have substantially the same limitations as the respective apparatus claims 1-5. Therefore, they are subject to the same rejection. Note that DNS servers at different levels are in communication with each other to share information and update the database.

Conclusion

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Dillon et al (6,658,463), Wills et al (6,584,082), Willis et al (6,385,647), Nandikonda et al (6,314,111), and Lee et al (6,751,459).

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian D Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-3084. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30-6:00 Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kenneth Vanderpuye can be reached on (571) 272-3078. The fax phone

Page 4

Application/Control Number: 09/841,357

Art Unit: 2661

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

9/28/04

BRIAN NGUYEN